

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are now present in the case. Consideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos ("Bezos"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,975 to Aggarwal ("Aggarwal"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites, in part:

1. A method for enhancing the process of e-commerce, comprising the steps of...
dynamically generating a custom product page based on said populated template and an identified on-line marketplace;

The independent claim recites "dynamically generating a custom product page" from a template containing information about a product and an on-line marketplace. The method of claim 1 also tracks activity on the generated product pages to determine what pairings of on-line marketplaces and products maximize product sales. The claimed element of "dynamically generating a custom product page based on" a "populated template" provides a benefit by streamlining the updating of product information across multiple on-line marketplaces through automatic generation of product pages.

The Examiner admits that Bezos does not disclose the claimed element of "dynamically generating a custom product page ..."

The Examiner contends that deficiency is remedied by the teaching of Aggarwal.
Applicants respectfully disagree.

Aggarwal describes a method for “dynamically assigning advertisements to appropriate slots on appropriate web pages.” See Aggarwal, col. 2, lines 34-35. However, this assignment of advertisements does not involve “dynamically generating a custom product page based on said populated template and an identified on-line marketplace.” Rather, Aggarwal addresses “dynamically placing objects in slots on a web page.” See Aggarwal, col. 2, lines 55-57. Aggarwal does not generate “a custom product page” from a “populated template,” but inserts advertisements into available slots on previously created web pages. The number of web pages that exist with Aggarwal is static. Instead of “generating a custom product page,” Aggarwal discloses “optimizing placement of the advertisements” on a web page, which does not include generating a new page from a template. See Aggarwal, col. 1, lines 46-48. Nowhere does Aggarwal disclose “dynamically generating a custom product page based on said populated template and an identified on-line marketplace.”

Aggarwal discloses dynamically changing slots on a single web page identified by a single URL. For example, Aggarwal changes the destination of a link on a web page, but does not alter any other content, including the URL for that web page. Claim 1 generates a custom web page each of which is identified by its own URL. For example, to sell a product using on-line marketplace A and marketplace B, claim 1 creates two unique web pages with distinct URLs, one page customized for display on marketplace A and the other designed for display on marketplace B.

Thus, Aggarwal fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each of the claim limitations recited in independent claim 1, as required for an obviousness rejection. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974); MPEP § 2143.03. As a result, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1.

As noted above, Applicants have overcome the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 as unpatentable over Aggarwal. The Examiner does not contend and, in fact, Bezos does not provide any additional teaching that overcomes the deficiencies in Aggarwal identified above. That is, neither Aggarwal nor Bezos, either alone or in combination, discloses, suggests, or implies the element of:

... dynamically generating a custom product page based on said populated template and an identified on-line marketplace ...

as disclosed in independent claim 1.

Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Bezos in view of Aggarwal, as these references do not teach or suggest all elements of the claim. Applicants note that claims 2-16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, as well as recite other patentable features. Hence, for at least the reasons set forth above, claims 2-16 are also patentable over Bezos in view of Aggarwal.

Based on these Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1-16 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
BJORN ESPENES, ET AL.

Dated: _____

7/29/05

By: _____

Greg T. Sueoka, Reg. No.: 33,800

Attorney for Applicants

Fenwick & West LLP

Silicon Valley Center

801 California Street

Mountain View, CA 94041

Tel.: (650) 335-7194

Fax: (650) 938-5200